Why It Would Be Smart to Recognize Peking Now, P. 2

Kennedy's Latest on Nuclear Policy Implies Acceptance of The Spread of Atomic Arms, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 37 OCTOBER 17, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Mark Twain Would Have Enjoyed Dr. Pauling's Inquisition

Washington, Oct. 11

Senator Dodd, in opening the hearing of Dr. Linus Pauling before the Internal Security Committee here today, showed himself to be in the finest tradition of American dead-pan humor. Anticipating Dr. Pauling's refusal to hand over the names of those who helped gather signatures for his famous petition to the UN on nuclear testing, Senator Dodd said no witness need fear "opprobrium because he is called to testify before this Committee." To clinch his point he cited the cases of FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover and CIA Director Allen Dulles, both of whom had appeared before it, he said, without indelible stain on their reputations.* This opening remark met competition for a Mark Twain award when the committee's counsel, Jules Sourwine, tirelessly digging for subversive tendencies among the signers of the petition, asked Dr. Pauling whether he was aware that there were "known Communists" among the members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences who had put their signatures to it. The least the Russians can do in return for this reassuring news is to elect Cyrus Eaton to membership so there will be one known capitalist on the rolls, too.

The DW's Most Faithful Reader

Mr. Sourwine followed this revelation with an analysis prepared by Benjamin Mandel showing Dr. Pauling's "affiliations with Communist-controlled organizations or activities supporting the Communist Party, USA, or individual members thereof." Mr. Mandel, the research director of the committee, was once business manager of the now defunct *Daily Worker,* and remains its most faithful reader in the capital; he has been over its crumbling files so often there must be whole years he can recite from memory. Of his 25 "citations" 21 were butttressed in scholarly fashion by references to DW or SW *Sunday Worker;* five by references to DPW, the now defunct *People's Daily World,* its Pacific Coast analogue; and two to "Lttrhd" no doubt obtained for the committee by repentant Marxist-Leninists now practicing free enterprise for the FBI. Mr. Mandel's research always pointed leftward, of course, never right; thus Dr. Pauling was put down for signing a statement against the McCarran Internal Security Act (DW 9/21/59, p. 9), but no reference was made to the fact that President Truman vetoed the act the very next day (9/22/50).

The Pauling hearing reached its climax early when he submitted the original signatures appended to his petition but declined again to furnish the names of those who helped him circulate it. The hearing went on for hours afterward, past luncheon recess and midway to five o'clock, with questions which ranged wide in time and space. Had he ever been to East Berlin? No. Was he once chairman of a committee to welcome the Dean of Canterbury to Los Angeles? Yes. Had he ever known Ethel Rosenberg? No. Did he know that Prof. Yakawa one of his Japanese signers had been awarded the Lenin Prize? No, but he knew he got the Nobel prize. The committee's counsel went all the way back to Bernstein's Fish Grotto in San Francisco, scene of the most improbable fish story ever brought up by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Did Dr. Pauling know that Martin Kamen one of his signers was named in a 1948 Un Am report on atomic espionage as having "very definitely" given "classified information" to Soviet officials in Bernstein's Fish Grotto during World War II while agents listened in from an adjoining booth? Dr. Pauling as very definitely remembered that Dr.

(Continued on Page Four)

Communist Caucus in SANE?

Mr. Sourwine. Is there, Mr. Abrams, a Communist caucus within the Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy?

Mr. Abrams. I must decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Sen. Dodd. Would you repeat that question for me?

Mr. Sourwine. Is there a Communist caucus within the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy?

Sen. Dodd. Caucus?

Mr. Sourwine. Yes.

Mr. Abrams. My answer has been recorded.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know what I mean by a Communist caucus, Mr. Abrams?

Sen. Dodd. Well, I don't. The witness is deciding whether he is answering that question or not. I don't know what it means. Tell me.

Mr. Sourwine. I would rather have the witness answer first, if he knows what is meant by a Communist caucus.

Mr. Abrams. I decline to answer for the same reasons.

Sen. Dodd. Educate me, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. Sourwine. A Communist caucus is a smaller organized unit within a particular organization; that is, it is the Communist group, usually a minority, and the caucus is used for the purpose of helping take control of the organization, making themselves most effective.

Mr. Abrams. I won't refuse to answer that. I have never heard of it before.

—P. 25, Communist Infiltration in the Nuclear Test Ban Movement, Senate Internal Security Hearing released Oct. 12, testimony of Henry H. Abrams.

*** Of course neither was asked in the manner sometimes encountered by less august witnesses whether he had ever consorted with Fascists, robbed a poor box or practiced necrophilia.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Ought to Initiate Negotiations With Communist China Now

The election campaign seems to have turned into a battle over the islands. Kennedy, one might summarize it, wants to give up Quemoy and Matsu, and reoccupy Cuba.* But the Quemoy-Matsu issue, on which Kennedy makes more sense than Nixon, is already dated. The real question which ought to be debated now is the future of Formosa. We are always talking of taking the initiative. But to take the initiative requires daring and imagination. The vote in the United Nations shows that we cannot hope much longer to impose our will against a majority of mankind and keep Communist China out of the UN. If the United States were not hamstrung by the sinister power which Chiang's men exert in American politics, we would take the initiative and open negotiations with Peking. No Chinese regime will ever reconcile itself to the loss of Formosa much less to its use as a base by a hostile power from across the Pacific. But an agreement which would save face all around, and enable Chiange to live out his remaining years on a Formosa federated with the mainland, is possible, as broadcasts from Peking have hinted from time to time.

Formosa "An Area of Freedom"?

From the standpoint of power politics, negotiations with Peking would be shrewd. For the signs of a sharp difference within the Soviet bloc were made plain enough by the failure of the other Communist States (except Albania) to be represented at the recent anniversary celebrations in Peking. To reopen China's doors on the Pacific by diplomatic relations with the U.S. and its ally, Japan, would give Peking alternatives in its dealings with Moscow. Recognition of Peking at this time would do on a bigger and more important scale what our support of Tito did in his struggle with Stalin. The revolutionary intransigeance of the Peking regime should not delude a sophisticated diplomacy. Those nations are revolutionary and intransigeant which have nothing to lose; the way to tame the outlaw is to bring him inside the family of nations. When Peking has vested interests in peace and trade with the capitalist nations, it will be less ready to pursue an adventurous policy in stirring up trouble within the colonial system. And the ending of the colonial system, which is inevitable, must be done peacefully and gradually or it will set off a new world war. Let us not forget that Mao's regime four years ago was more "revisionist" than Khrushchov's. If our diplomacy was wise—and free from China Lobby influence—this is the direction in which it would move. To talk of Nationalist China, as Nixon does, as an "area of freedom" is nonsense. The savage sentence just imposed on the publisher Lei Chen for having the temerity to try and organize an opposition China Democratic party on Formosa, and the swift and one-sided character of his kangaroo court trial, is evidence of that.

*** We note with derision that Kennedy in his full dress speech on Cuba at Cincinnati Oct. 6 quoted with respect the testimony of our two pro-Batista Ambassadors, Arthur Gardner, and Earl Smith before the Senate Internal Security Committee.**

What Wicked Ideas These Chinese Spread

"On 16 April, there appeared in Peiping an article of great significance in the magazine Red Star . . . this same article does not even recoil from the thought of a world-wide war, a war fought with hydrogen bombs."

—Ambassador Wadsworth at the UN, Oct. 1.

"Many Americans believe, blindly, than an all-out nuclear war would be the end of the world and of civilization. It would be neither. . . . We must realize that an all-out nuclear attack would not leave our nation uninhabitable. Radio activity decays. . . . We could emerge from shelters to clean up and rebuild. . . . New York's Governor Rockefeller makes sense in his campaign for the construction of relatively cheap home shelters (which) . . . could save up to 75 percent of our people."

—Dr. Edward Teller, in This Week magazine, Oct. 9

"Mind you radiation is not a pretty thing and, if nuclear war comes, it will be no picnic. It is even theoretically possible that the human race will some day achieve the ability to end its own existence forever. . . . But that day is not here now. . . . At a rough guess, in case of a nuclear exchange between this country and the Soviet Union, the average American citizen would run about the same risk as a combat infantryman in Europe in the last war."

—Stewart Alsop in Readers Digest for October.

"Many accept the idea that shelter can effectively reduce casualties but believe that survival in the post attack environment would be impossible. . . . A radio-active environment will take its toll. This fact must not be minimized. But . . . the proportion of still born children should be no worse than 30 years ago. . . . History offers further evidence that a civilization can recover from a devastating war. Take, for example, the Thirty Years' War. . . . Entire districts were turned into deserts, wolves ran in the streets of once populated cities . . . cannibalism was widespread. Yet, in roughly 50 years. . . ."

—American Strategy for the Nuclear Age, a newly published cold war symposium with contributions by Dean Acheson, David Sarnoff, Hanson Baldwin, J. Edgar Hoover, Herman Kahn and Henry Kissinger. See Pages 331-2, on "The Strategic Role of Civil Defense".

Who's Threatening Whom With That H-Bomb Peking Does Not Even Possess?

"World opinion was quite skeptical when a number of prominent personalities began, about two years ago, to tell of conversations with Chinese Communist leaders, in which those leaders said that China could withstand a hydrogen war because, even after losing some 300 million people, they would still have 300 million left who could proceed to communize the world."

—Ambassador Wadsworth opposing China's admission to the UN, General Assembly Oct. 1

"The U.S. representative . . . knows only too well that the Chinese People's Republic has no nuclear weapons, no hydrogen bombs. It is the U.S. that has at its disposal these means of mass destruction. . . . It is rather China that has reasons to fear the danger of military action on the part of the U.S. . . . It is not China's navy which is operating off the coast of the U.S. . . . It is not Chinese military planes which are violating the air space of the U.S. . . ."

—Prime Minister Gomulka (Poland) replying Oct. 6

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bad Time for Washington and Moscow Not to Be On Speaking Terms

U.S. policy is dangerously rigid. We keep the door shut against Peking, thus denying ourselves the advantages of a divide-and-rule strategy in dealing with the Soviet bloc. At the same time we treat Khrushchov with hostility, although this might mean his overthrow by the "hards" inside the Kremlin who agree with Peking on the hopelessness of trying to co-exist peacefully with the "imperialist" powers. It is going to be hard for Khrushchov to argue on his return to Moscow that his ideas of peaceful collaboration with capitalism have been successful, and he is going to have to play tough to maintain his own position. Coming events will show how stupid was our unwillingness to let the neutral powers save face all around by "forcing" a meeting between Eisenhower and Khrushchov. The symbolic value would have been great, and would have made it easier for a new administration to deal with the Russians.

Series of Crises Ahead

A whole series of crises lies ahead which will shake the UN and the world: Algeria, where Moscow is swinging over to a revolutionary policy in competition with Peking; Berlin, where Khrushchov is under pressure to show that he can get results; the Congo, where Western intrigue has destroyed the fragile beginnings of parliamentary government. Africa is a series of time bombs: Angola, Rhodesia, Kenya, and the Union of South Africa. The more one studies the situation the more statesmanlike appears to be Senator Mansfield's recent speech suggesting that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. negotiate a neutralization of the area to facilitate its movement toward independence. To have the U.S. and U.S.S.R. virtually not on speaking terms during the months ahead is a catastrophe. The fact that Khrushchov's rudeness as well as Eisenhower's laziness (there is really no other word for his indifference to the UN proceedings) share responsibility is no consolation.

Kennedy's simple-minded emphasis on more growth and more arms is a very inadequate response to the complexities of the changes taking place in the world: the emergence of a soon-to-be-dominant neutralist bloc in the UN, the British Labor Party's vote for neutralism and renunciation of nuclear weapons, de Gaulle's not so dissimilar fight against unilateral atomic decisions by the U.S. Fresh thinking, abandonment of old cliches, are required but nowhere in evidence.

NOTE: Because of the Pauling hearing, we were unable to cover the historic argument in the Supreme Court on the trio of cases testing the constitutionality of the Smith Act's membership clause and of the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act.

Kennedy on Nuclear Tests and Arms

Senator Kennedy has always been more friendly to what is called "arms control" than to disarmament. The tendency is apparent in his letter to Thomas E. Murray, who advocates resumption now of nuclear testing underground and in outer space. While rejecting this idea "at this time", Senator Kennedy is ambiguous. At one point the Senator speaks of the world-wide hope of an agreement to ban all tests. But in explaining what he would do if elected, he talks of seeking an agreement "of which limitations upon nuclear tests, weapons grade fissionable material, biological and chemical warfare agents will be an essential and integral part." This means acceptance of the idea of biological and chemical warfare as part of the permanent and legal arsenal of mankind and it implies limiting rather than abolishing nuclear tests.

There also seems implicit in Senator Kennedy's reply the idea of accepting the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers. Thus he pledges himself to "invite leading nations having industrial capacity for production of nuclear weapons" to a conference to seek agreement "upon means of international control of both the production and use of weapons grade fissionable material and also the production of nuclear weapons." Again this speaks of "control" not of agreement to prevent the spread of such weapons or of their renunciation. "Control" is the Pentagon's hope because it can open the door to endless negotiation about arms quotas, while the arms race goes on.

The Review of the International Atomic Policies and Programs of the United States just released by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reports that the early hopes of cheap atomic power have fizzled, and with it the hope that by spreading atomic reactors for peaceful uses we could slow up the nuclear arms race. It warns, on the contrary, that "in the absence of lessened tensions and effective safeguards, achievement of widespread atomic power could in fact make the arms limitation problem more difficult." To "control" nuclear arms in this context may only be to legalize and facilitate their spread. Mr. Frank Aiken, the Irish Foreign Minister, continuing his year-after-year crusade at the UN against the spread of nuclear weapons, warned in his speech on August 6, "Every addition to the list of countries possessing nuclear weapons increases the danger of their use for defense, for aggression, for revenge or for revolution." This is the perspective blurred by talk of limitation and control.

Origin and Progress of the Struggle to Make the Congo Safe for Democracy

"Colonel Mobutu . . . once did a seven year stretch in the Congo army. . . . After independence, Lumumba . . . made him chief of staff . . . he grew angry at Lumumba's whimsical use of the military. . . . Mobutu became a frequent visitor to the U.S. embassy and held long talks with officials there. One afternoon last week, Mobutu conferred with officers at Camp Leopold, and got their cheering support, That night he went to Radio Congo and abruptly announced that the army was taking over."

—Time Magazine, Sept. 26

"Reports from the provinces said many deputies and senators of Lumumba's parliamentary delegation were ready to withdraw their support. Some 30 pro-Lumumba deputies and senators have already defected, and Mobutu was reported ready to authorize the reopening of Parliament if an anti-Lumumba majority was assured."

—Reuters, in Washington Post, Oct. 8

"The loyalty of many political leaders to Mr. Lumumba—particularly in the interior—continued to impede reconstruction efforts of the government commission installed by Army Leader Col. Joseph Mobutu. The commission's spokesman, Albert Bolela, told a news conference the Congo's political leaders 'are not sufficiently mature to make a synthesis of western democratic institutions and the tribal realities of the Congo'."

—AP from Leopoldsville, Washington Star, Oct. 9

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Abrams, Attacked by Dodd, Was Also Attacked in Sunday Worker

(Continued from Page One)

Kamen had been cleared of these charges and won a libel suit against a Chicago newspaper which printed them. Perhaps all these questions were designed to distract attention from the failure of the Chairman to take any action toward a contempt citation after Dr. Pauling's refusal to furnish the names he had been ordered to bring. When the long hearing ended, Senator Dodd said such action was up to the committee.

Nixon Would Be Put on the Spot

This hesitation may have more than one explanation. Dr. Pauling's application for a review in the Supreme Court of his action to enjoin the committee is still pending before it. Failure to cite him for contempt would moot it. Then, again, with the Senate out of session, Richard Nixon would have to sign and transmit it to the U.S. Attorney if it were voted by the committee; this would make him look too uncomfortably like the old Nixon. Dodd may fear a defeat at the hands of his own committee if he asks for a contempt citation; no other Senator even showed up for the hearing—perhaps they see no mileage in pillorying a world famous scientist on so popular an issue as cessation of testing. Finally, considering the Watkins decision, Dr. Pauling's denial of communism and his ready answer to all other questions, it is doubtful whether a contempt conviction would hold up on appeal. Unfortunately Senator Dodd's larger objective does not require Dr. Pauling's conviction. His larger objective is to destroy the National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy, and to make people fearful of speaking up against nuclear testing and for disarmament lest they find themselves "controversial" or perhaps worse. His attack on the Committee on the eve of its Madison Square Garden meeting last May has already started a disruptive chain reaction within the organization.

The day after the Pauling hearing, as if to link him more closely, the committee released a pamphlet called "Communist Infiltration in the Nuclear Test Ban Movement" which contains the transcript of the executive hearing last May 13 which threw the nuclear policy committee into a panic. The witness was Henry H. Abrams, a New York City accountant, who had been active in organizing the Garden meeting.

He Dared Disagree With the President

"We then moved on to the Fair Play for Cuba advertisement. . . . Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? . . . Was I aware that President Eisenhower had made a speech in which he stated that the Castro regime was a menace to the stability of the Western hemisphere? No, I was not. And did I think myself justified in holding opinions that openly defied those of the President? I brooded over this for a long incredulous moment, and then replied that I was English, and that I had been forming opinions all my life without worrying for a second whether or not they coincided with those of the President of the United States. Had my wits been active enough, I might have pointed out that Senator Dodd himself, as a Democrat, must have sometimes have found himself in the heretical position of having to defy President Eisenhower."

—Kenneth Tynan in Harpers for October describing his own ordeal before the Internal Security Committee. Mr. Tynan, the distinguished theatre critic of the London Observer was then guest critic on The New Yorker.

This release for the first time enables one to judge how much fire there was behind all that smoke. A careful reading shows nothing discreditable to Mr. Abrams except that he took the Fifth amendment on his political associations. One can infer from this that he was a party member. But it would seem from the committee's own evidence that he no longer is. Indeed the document reprinted by the Senate committee on pages 16 and 17 seems to indicate that while Mr. Abrams is being pilloried as a communist boring-from-within the nuclear policy movement, he was criticized in the *Sunday Worker* two years ago by the Communist Benjamin J. Davis for fostering Trotzkyites boring from within in an Independent Socialist movement Mr. Abrams helped to launch. Mr. Abrams' connections with the Communist party, like his importance in the nuclear policy committee, seem to have been exaggerated by the Senate committee. Perhaps the availability now of the actual hearing record will make it possible more coolly to reconsider his hasty suspension without trial last May and to end any tendency to truckle to Senator Dodd.

Please Renew Early and Help Us If You Can By Adding A Gift Sub

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

10/17/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED